



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,058	01/22/2004	Hiroshi Uno	1990.69202	3718

24978 7590 03/17/2006

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN  
300 S WACKER DR  
25TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
----------

KAPADIA, VARSHA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2651

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Art Unit: 2651

This office action is responsive to the communication filed on 01/03/06.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed et al (5,961,658).

With regards to claim 7, Reed et al discloses a signal processing method utilizing a partial response to record information on a medium and then regenerate the information from the medium (see fig. 2 and disclosure thereof), wherein a signal recorded on the medium is subjected to the convolution of  $(1-D)$  where  $D$  is a bit delay operator (See fig.6 element 152 disclosure thereof and col.11 lines 59-67); a regeneration signal from the medium is subjected to an equalizing process including the convolution of  $(k-s*D).(1+D)^n$  (see the paragraph bridging cols. 6 and 7; wherein  $k$  and  $s$  are considered to be 1).

With regards to claim 8, Reed et al discloses that the information is decoded from the equalized signal (see fig.2 elements 74,88 and 92 and disclosure thereof).

With regards to claims 9-12, the apparatus limitations recited in claims 9-12 and similar to the method limitations recited in claims 7-8. Therefore the rejection applied to method claims 7-8 above in this office action is herein repeated for the same reasons of anticipation.

Art Unit: 2651

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-6 are allowed.

Applicant's claimed invention differs from the prior art of the record for the same reasons recited in the office action mailed on August 26, 2005.

### **Response to Remarks**

Applicant's arguments filed on January 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "(1-D) in claims 7,9, and 11 are within the main paths of the demodulating circuit" and argued that "The Filter 152 of (1-D) in Reed is not present in the main paths of the demodulating circuit, but is present in the REMOD 138") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant further argue that the convolution of (1-D) and (1+D) relied upon "corresponds to  $k=s=1$ , in claims 7,9 and 11. As seen above,  $n=2$  in Reed. Thus, Reed does not anticipate claims 7,9 and 11 because  $n$  is a positive integer other than 2 in claim 7". Examiner respectfully disagree because applicant has not specify in claims 7,9 or 11 that  $k$  is not  $=s$ . Furthermore, as defined by Reed in the paragraph bridging cols. 6 and 7,  $n$  is not limited to 2.

Rejection applied to claims is therefore considered proper.

### **Conclusion**

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2651

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Varsha A. Kapadia whose telephone number is (571) 272-7557. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon Tue and Thurs. from 6:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington can be reached on 571 272 4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



VK

  
K. WONG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER